

REMARKS

Claims 3 – 16, 19 – 21 and 24 - 26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 17, 18, 22, 23 and 27 were previously canceled. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner is allowing claims 3 – 8 and 12.

In section 1 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to. More specifically, the Office Action indicates that the drawings do not show a Koehler illumination in an x-direction and a y-direction. Applicants are amending the claims to avoid the recital of a Koehler illumination in an x-direction and a y-direction, thus rendering moot the objection to the drawings. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 9 - 11, 13 - 16, 19 - 21 and 24 - 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. More specifically, the Office Action indicates that the specification does describe a Koehler illumination in an x-direction and a y-direction. Applicants are amending the claims to avoid the recital of a Koehler illumination in an x-direction and a y-direction.

Claim 9 provides for an illumination system. The illumination system includes, *inter alia*, a first optical element, which is divided into first raster elements. The illumination system produces a two-dimensional image of the first raster elements in an object plane of the illumination system.

The specification discloses a production of a two-dimensional image of raster elements in an object plane of an illumination system, for example, in passages at page 2, line 5 and 30 - 31; page 10, lines 25 - 28; page 11, lines 9 - 10 and 15 - 16; and page 12, lines 21 - 22. Thus, the specification supports the above-noted recital of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 fulfills the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 14, 15, 20, 21 and 26 each includes a recital similar to that of claim 9, as described above. Therefore, Accordingly, Applicants submit that all of claims 14, 15, 20, 21 and 26 fulfill the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 10, 11 and 13 depend from claim 9. Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Claim 19 depends from claim 9. Claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 20. Applicants submit that the recitals of all of claims 10, 11, 13, 16, 19, 24 and 25 are supported by the specification, and therefore fulfill the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, Applicants are amending the claims to address an objection to the drawings, and to address a section 112 rejection. None of the amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any term of any of the claims, and therefore, the doctrine of equivalents should be available for all of the terms of all of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Date

February 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Charles N.J. Ruggiero

Reg. No. 28,468

Attorney for the Applicants

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401